

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully studied the outstanding Official Action mailed on April 10, 2007. This response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Claims 20-25 and 28 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hassler et al in view of Gruenewald et al.

Claim 26 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hassler et al in view of Gruenewald et al and Reichenberger.

Claim 27 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hassler et al in view of Gruenewald et al and Ein-Gal.

The above rejections are respectfully traversed. As explained in detail in the previous response, Claim 20 recites “a second membrane that covers an end face of said reflector” (emphasis added). The membrane [1] of Hassler does not cover an end face of reflector 33. It is respectfully noted that the Examiner’s statement that membrane [1] disclosed at col. 5, lines 19-22 surrounds reflector [33] is an error. Just the opposite is true – that passage says: “The annular reflector 33 surrounding the membrane 1”. The reflector surrounds membrane [1] not the other way around. Membrane 1 has nothing to do with covering an end face of the reflector. As stated at the beginning of the description, it is part of the shockwave transducer: “A coil 2 is disposed inside the membrane 1, the coil tube being wound in the form of a cylindrical helix on a cylindrical coil carrier 3.” Examiner has not addresses this point.

It is also insufficient to state that “it is well known in the art to include a membrane to shield source devices and their associated reflectors from the propagation medium”. That is not the claimed structure. The Examiner has failed to show prior art that teaches the claimed structure of claim 20, particularly, “a first membrane that covers an open end of said first shockwave source device in order to seal said first shockwave source device from ingress therein of the propagation medium; [and] a second membrane that covers an end face of said reflector”. This structure is not known in the art and is deemed patentable.

In the Office Action, Examiner further states that in Gruenewald, “Fig. 3 clearly shows spatial adjacency of sources P and E and suggests that one device sealingly passes through the membrane of the second.”

The above statement is respectfully traversed. P is a piezoelectric shock wave source and E is an electromagnetic shock wave source. In Fig. 3, there is only one membrane and P and E do not pass through it at all. It is respectfully noted that the Examiner’s statement that

“one device sealingly passes through the membrane of the second” is an error. It is clear from the drawing none of the devices passes through the membrane.

Although no amendments are deemed necessary in light of the above arguments, for the sake of expediting allowance claim 20 has been amended to recite “first membrane that covers an open end of said first shockwave source device non-parallel to said longitudinal axis of symmetry in order to seal said first shockwave source device from ingress therein of the propagation medium, said first membrane being shaped differently from the reflective surface of said reflector”. This structure is not found in the prior art and is clear from the originally filed specification and drawings. Claim 29 has also been added to recite further patentable structure. No new matter has been introduced.

Claims 20-29 are accordingly respectfully deemed patentable. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the final rejection and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

DEKEL PATENT LTD.

BY /David Klein/

David Klein, Patent Agent

Reg. No. 41,118

Tel 972-8-949-5334

Fax 972-949-5323

E-mail: dekelltd@netvision.net.il